

[House Hearing, 107 Congress]
[From the U.S. Government Printing Office]

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2003

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT
SONNY CALLAHAN, Alabama

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky	PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	CHET EDWARDS, Texas
TOM LATHAM, Iowa	ED PASTOR, Arizona
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	JAMES E. CLYBURN, South Carolina
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri	
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California	

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

Robert Schmidt, Jeanne L. Wilson, and Kevin V. Cook, Staff Assistants

PART 3

	Page
Bureau of Reclamation.....	1
Testimony of the Secretary of the Interior.....	1
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	740

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2002

79-478

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida, Chairman

RALPH REGULA, Ohio	DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
JERRY LEWIS, California	JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky	NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico	MARTIN OLAV SABO, Minnesota
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
TOM DeLAY, Texas	ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia
JIM KOLBE, Arizona	MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
SONNY CALLAHAN, Alabama	NANCY PELOSI, California
JAMES T. WALSH, New York	PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, Indiana
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
DAVID L. HOBSON, Ohio	JOSE E. SERRANO, New York
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr., Oklahoma	ROSA L. DeLAURO, Connecticut
HENRY BONILLA, Texas	JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
JOE KNOLLENBERG, Michigan	JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
DAN MILLER, Florida	ED PASTOR, Arizona
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia	CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	CHET EDWARDS, Texas
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr., Washington	ROBERT E. ``BUD`` CRAMER, Jr., Alabama
RANDY ``DUKE`` CUNNINGHAM, California	PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
TODD TIAHRT, Kansas	JAMES E. CLYBURN, South Carolina
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee	MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
TOM LATHAM, Iowa	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky	SAM FARR, California
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr., Illinois
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri	CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, Michigan
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	ALLEN BOYD, Florida
KAY GRANGER, Texas	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania	STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California	
RAY LaHOOD, Illinois	
JOHN E. SWEENEY, New York	
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana	
DON SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania	
VIRGIL H. GOODE, Jr., Virginia	

James W. Dyer, Clerk and Staff Director

(ii)

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2003

Thursday, February 28, 2002.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WITNESSES

GALE NORTON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
JOHN W. KEYS III, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
RONALD JOHNSON, PROGRAM DIRECTOR, CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACT
PROGRAM
JOHN D. TREZISE, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
ROBERT WOLF, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM AND BUDGET, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. Callahan's Opening Remarks

Mr. Callahan. Well, good morning, everyone. Welcome to our little committee room and to our subcommittee hearing today. It is nice to have you with us. Madam Secretary, we are pleased to have you with us, the Secretary of the Interior, and she is accompanied by Mr. John Keys, who is the Commissioner of Reclamation. Commissioner, nice to have you here, and your staff as well that are with you.

Madam Secretary and Commissioner Keys, we look forward, as always to working with you this year, with the budget constraints and under the circumstances, as we try to establish the resources that might be available to you during the next fiscal year. We have received your request. We will review it, and I hope that we have a successful year. I hope that you all agree, at the end of all of this process, that it was a successful year.

I do not have a big opening statement, so I will yield at this time to Secretary Norton. We will accept all of your statements for the record in its entirety, and invite you now to address the committee.

Secretary Norton's Opening Remarks

Secretary Norton. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Members of the committee, good morning. It is a pleasure to be here with you today to discuss our budget request for fiscal year 2003. I am accompanied by John Keys, who is the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. He comes to this position with almost 35 years of service in the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Callahan. He had an excellent start in coming to his profession.

Secretary Norton. Yes, he did.

Mr. Callahan. He started in Alabama. [Laughter.]

Secretary Norton. That is right.

Also, with me is John Trezise, who is the director of Budget for the Department, and Bob Wolf who is the Budget Director for the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as Ron Johnston, directly behind him, who is the Program Director for the Central Utah Project Completion Act, and he has also submitted written testimony.

Before we go on to the details of the budget that is directly in front of this committee, I would like to talk about some of our overall observations for the Department.

The Department of Interior has a huge impact on the lives of Americans. Almost one in every 5 acres of land in this Nation is managed by the Department of Interior. These lands include some of the most beautiful and pristine areas on Earth. We are also entrusted with the symbols of our Nation's

patriotism from the Statue of Liberty to the Washington Monument and other symbols.

We provide approximately one-third of the Nation's domestic energy supply. We serve visitors from around the Nation with almost half a million visits to our lands and waters every year. Over 200,000 volunteers assist us, a workforce that exceeds our employees by almost three to one.

In the most recently completed fiscal year, we collected \$11 billion in revenue, which was approximately \$1 billion more than was appropriated to us. The Bureau of Reclamation itself provides the water that makes the arid West bloom. They deliver 11 trillion gallons of water to over 31 million people in the 17 Western States. They serve one out of every five Western farmers. Their irrigated lands produce 60 percent of the Nation's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruit.

As we began the process last June to build this year's budget, we were guided by President Bush's commitments to build a new environmentalism through cooperative conservation partnerships, to improve our management of public lands and waters, to advance the development of domestic energy, to improve both the classrooms and the classroom performance of Indian students, and to manage for excellence through citizen-centered governance.

Our budget priorities, as for the rest of the Federal Government, were reshaped by the events of September 11th. Interior's employees have responded to the call to increase our vigilance and our preparedness for the changed world we face. In the wake of the events of September 11th, we put into place security measures to protect our most important national assets, our visitors, and our employees. We instituted around-the-clock security at key reclamation facilities, including Hoover, Glen Canyon, Shasta and Grand Coulee Dams.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ISSUES

The Department's 2003 budget request for programs funded by this committee is \$881 million in current appropriations. This is a reduction of \$33 million compared with the budget enacted in 2002. There are a few issues outside this committee's area, but certainly within the overall Appropriations Committee's consideration that I would like to highlight.

One of our leading initiatives is the Cooperative Conservation Initiative. This is a \$100 million request that would be divided half and half between grants to the States and programs for our three land management agencies: Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service.

The idea behind this is to provide funding to resolve conservation problems by building partnerships. It would provide for the carrying out of projects that are conservation oriented, like watershed enhancement, wetlands restoration and so forth, by having partnerships with States, local Governments, private conservation organizations, farmers and so forth.

I think as you all look at the problems that you hear about

from your constituents, this is a tool that has not previously been available to the Federal Government to work with outside groups and try to resolve problems. We are also working hard on issues dealing with our Indian population. We have trust management issues that have received some publicity. We are working hard to resolve the issues related to trust management and to improve our management of those assets.

One aspect of this affects the Bureau of Reclamation. The District Court for the District of Columbia issued an order in December that shut down the Internet system for the Department. The Bureau of Reclamation Internet system remains down, but we are working hard with the court to provide assurances that information technology security measures are in place before systems are brought back on line, and so at this point, about 40 percent of our Department is on line. We are working to bring additional parts of our Department back on line, and to make payments and handle other matters that affect individuals by bringing our systems up on line.

Finally, we are committed to managing well the resources entrusted to us in this budget. We are working diligently to improve the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of the services we deliver and to enhance the accountability and transparency of the work we do with the resources of the American people.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'S BUDGET REQUEST

The Bureau of Reclamation's request for 2003 is \$845 million. An additional \$25 million is requested for the Governmentwide legislative proposal to shift pension system and health benefit costs to the Bureau. In support of sound water resource management and public safety, increases are proposed in the budget, including an \$11 million increase for the Safety of Dams program to continue modification work and ensure the safety of the public downstream.

The budget includes an increase of \$26.6 million for enhanced security at Bureau of Reclamation facilities, continuing the security enhancements we put in place this year.

The budget requests \$33 million for the Animas-La Plata project. This is for the scaled-down version of the project that was approved through an authorization process recently. This supports our commitment to the Colorado Ute Tribes and provides municipal and industrial water for the Tribes and local entities.

The Central Utah Project budget is \$36.2 million. An additional \$24,000 is requested for the legislative proposal to shift pension system and health benefit costs to the Agency.

The request includes \$12 million for use by the District to continue the modified construction of the Diamond Fork System. We will be closing off a section of the original tunnel that experienced an unforeseen cave-in and resulted in the release of dangerous gas.

We are developing a plan for the construction of alternative facilities, along with cost estimates, and will share this information with you as soon as it is available.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to work with you on crafting our fiscal year 2003

budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank you for your invitation last year to visit the Alabama Delta. I look forward to perhaps being able to do that this year. Last year was a little bit challenging, and I was not able to do so, but I do certainly appreciate the invitation.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Norton follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.001

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.002

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.003

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.004

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.005

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.006

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.007

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.008

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.009

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.010

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.011

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.012

Mr. Callahan. The invitation is still there.

Secretary Norton. Thank you.

Mr. Callahan. I have so informed the principals of that Cleansing of the Delta program. I have discussed this with you, and we certainly would welcome you at any time.

Secretary Norton. Thank you.

Mr. Callahan. You pick out the time, and I will make it available.

Secretary Norton. Terrific. Thank you.

Mr. Callahan. Thank you.

Commissioner?

Commissioner Keys' Opening Remarks

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure to be here and have the opportunity to talk to you about the Bureau of Reclamation's 2003 budget presentation. We appreciate the continued support from the subcommittee, and we look forward to working with you on some of the issues that we all have to deal with during the year.

I would ask that my full written statement be included for the record.

Mr. Chairman, we are proud of the Bureau of Reclamation. This year marks the Centennial year for water service in the West through the Bureau of Reclamation's programs. We have a large celebration scheduled over a year, and certainly we would

look forward to having you participate with us in the ceremonies. We will let you know as they come up and certainly provide adequate invitation for you to participate.

FY 2003 BUDGET REQUEST

As Secretary Norton has explained, our budget request totals almost \$870 million in current authority. That request includes \$726 million for our traditional Water and Related Resources programs, \$54 million for the Policy and Administration, and the \$25 million for the Civil Service Retirement System and the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program changes.

We have also requested \$15 million for the California Bay-Delta program and \$49 million for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

From our perspective, this budget is good news for the West. As is our tradition, Reclamation is focused on customer value, as well as increased accountability and modernization of our facilities.

The fiscal year 2003 request is fiscally responsible. We think it will provide funding to keep our dams and facilities safe, to deliver the water that they provide for, and to provide a stable source of power for our growing population and support the environmental efforts that we have underway.

It demonstrates Reclamation's commitment to meeting the West's needs for water and power in a fiscally responsible manner. Fiscal year 2003 request for the Water and Related Resources Account is \$726 million. That provides funding for our five major program activities: \$289 million for Water and Energy, \$40 million for Land Management, \$89 million for Fish and Wildlife programs, \$182 million for Facility Operations, and \$162 million for Facility Maintenance and Rehabilitation.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FY 2003 REQUEST

Some of the highlights of this 2003 request include \$81 million for our Safety of Dams program, which is one of Reclamation's highest priorities. That request includes modifications at Horsetooth Dam in Colorado and Wickiup Dam in Oregon. This program also provides for risk management activities throughout Reclamation's inventory of 432 dams and dikes.

The request also includes \$28.4 million for Site Security and Counterterrorism protections. This covers our continued heightened public safety and security efforts at Reclamation facilities. That includes \$26.6 million specifically for counterterrorism measures, including guards and surveillance at all of our facilities and equipment to provide increased security for the general public, Reclamation employees and those facilities.

The request includes \$33 million for the construction of the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado. During fiscal year 2003, a lot of that money will go for the continuation of cultural resource mitigation activities, the completion of a natural gas pipeline relocation, wetlands fish and wildlife mitigation, and the award of construction contracts for Ridges

Basin Dam and the Durango Pumping Plant.

The request includes \$15 million for the Columbia River-Snake River Salmon Recovery program in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Wyoming. That addresses Reclamation's legal requirements contained in the biological opinions issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

The request also includes \$14.3 million for our Klamath project in Northern California and Southern Oregon, which contains funding for the continued operation of that project and for continued studies for improving the water supply and water quality to meet agricultural, tribal, wildlife refuge and environmental needs in the basin. Just yesterday we released a biological assessment for the continued operation of that project over the next 10 years.

The request also includes about \$12 million for lower Colorado River operations in California, Arizona and Nevada. That funds the work necessary to carry out the Secretary's responsibility as water master of the Colorado River.

The request includes about \$35 million for the Central Arizona Project, which continues construction on the Gila River Indian Community Distribution System and other Indian distribution systems in Arizona; also, some work on recreation development and fulfillment of Endangered Species Act mitigation commitments for Roosevelt Dam and for the Central Arizona Project Aqueduct on the Gila, Santa Cruz, and San Pedro Rivers. Funding is also requested to continue working in the Tucson area for municipal entities that get water from the facility.

The request includes about \$129 million for the Central Valley Project in California. That provides funding for 15 units, including operation and maintenance of the Central Valley Project. Among the activities proposed for funding is \$5.4 million for the Placer County Water Agency Permanent Pumping facility.

For the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, we are requesting an appropriation of \$49 million. As you know, this is consistent with the provisions of the authorizing law and equal to the estimated collections for fiscal year 2003.

The request for the California Bay-Delta Restoration Fund is consistent with the commitment to find long-term solutions to improving water quality, habitat and ecological functions and water supply reliability in the Bay-Delta area.

It also includes \$15 million requested to be used for Environmental Water Account as well as costs associated with administrative support of CALFED. That is associated with the planning and management activities of our CALFED program and to support those activities of that staff.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my informal remarks. I would certainly be happy to answer any questions that you may have on parts of that program.

[The prepared statement of Commissioner Keys follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.013

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.014

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.015

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.016

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.017

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.018

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.019

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.020

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.021

Mr. Callahan. At this point, we'll put the budget justification material for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Utah Project Completion Account in the record, without objection.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.022

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.023

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.024

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.025

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.026

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.027

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.028

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.029

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.030

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.031

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.032

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.033

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.034

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.035

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.036

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.037

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.038

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.039

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.040

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.041

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.042

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.043

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.044

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.045

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.046

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.047

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.048

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.049

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.050

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.051

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.052

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.053

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.054

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.055

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.056

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.057

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.058

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.059

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.060

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.061

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.062

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.063

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.064

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.065

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.066

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.067

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.068

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.069

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.070

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.071

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.072

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.073

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.074

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.075

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.076

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.077

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.078

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.079

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.080

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.081

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.082

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.083

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.084

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.085

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.086

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.087

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.088

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.089

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.090

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.091

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.092

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.093

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.094

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.095

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.096

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.097

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.098

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.099

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.100

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.101

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.102

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.103

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.104

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.105

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.106

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.107

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.108

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.109

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.110

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.111

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.112

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.113

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.114

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.115

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.116

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.117

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.118

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.119

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.120

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.121

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.122

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.123

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.124

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.125

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.126

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.127

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.128

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.129

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.130

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.131

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.132

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.133

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.134

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.135

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.136

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.137

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.138

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.139

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.140

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.141

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.142

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.143

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.144

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.145

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.146

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.147

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.148

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.149

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.150

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.151

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.152

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.153

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.154

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.155

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.156

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.157

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.158

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.159

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.160

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.161

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.162

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.163

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.164

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.165

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.166

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.167

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.168

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.169

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.170

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.171

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.172

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.173

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.174

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.175

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.176

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.177

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.178

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.179

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.180

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.181

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.182

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.183

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.184

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.185

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.186

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.187

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.188

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.189

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.190

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.191

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.192

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.193

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.194

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.195

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.196

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.197

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.198

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.199

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.200

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.201

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.202

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.203

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.204

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.205

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.206

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.207

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.208

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.209

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.210

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.211

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.212

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.213

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.214

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.215

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.216

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.217

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.218

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.219

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.220

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.221

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.222

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.223

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.224

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.225

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.226

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.227

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.228

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.229

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.230

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.231

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.232

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.233

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.234

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.235

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.236

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.237

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.238

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.239

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.240

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.241

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.242

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.243

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.244

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.245

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.246

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.247

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.248

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.249

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.250

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.251

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.252

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.253

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.254

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.255

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.256

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.257

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.258

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.259

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.260

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.261

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.262

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.263

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.264

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.265

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.266

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.267

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.268

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.269

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.270

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.271

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.272

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.273

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.274

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.275

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.276

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.277

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.278

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.279

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.280

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.281

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.282

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.283

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.284

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.285

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.286

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.287

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.288

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.289

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.290

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.291

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.292

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.293

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.294

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.295

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.296

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.297

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.298

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.299

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.300

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.301

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.302

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.303

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.304

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.305

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.306

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.307

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.308

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.309

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.310

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.311

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.312

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.313

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.314

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.315

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.316

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.317

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.318

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.319

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.320

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.321

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.322

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.323

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.324

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.325

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.326

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.327

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.328

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.329

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.330

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.331

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.332

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.333

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.334

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.335

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.336

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.337

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.338

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.339

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.340

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.341

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.342

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.343

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.344

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.345

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.346

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.347

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.348

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.349

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.350

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.351

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.352

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.353

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.354

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.355

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.356

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.357

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.358

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.359

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.360

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.361

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.362

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.363

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.364

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.365

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.366

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.367

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.368

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.369

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.370

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.371

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.372

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.373

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.374

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.375

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.376

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.377

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.378

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.379

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.380

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.381

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.382

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.383

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.384

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.385

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.386

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.387

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.388

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.389

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.390

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.391

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.392

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.393

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.394

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.395

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.396

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.397

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.398

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.399

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.400

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.401

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.402

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.403

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.404

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.405

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.406

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.407

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.408

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.409

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.410

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.411

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.412

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.413

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.414

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.415

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.416

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.417

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.418

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.419

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.420

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.421

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.422

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.423

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.424

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.425

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.426

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.427

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.428

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.429

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.430

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.431

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.432

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.433

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.434

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.435

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.436

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.437

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.438

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.439

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.440

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.441

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.442

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.443

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.444

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.445

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.446

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.447

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.448

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.449

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.450

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.451

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.452

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.453

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.454

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.455

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.456

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.457

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.458

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.459

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.460

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.461

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.462

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.463

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.464

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.465

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.466

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.467

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.468

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.469

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.470

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.471

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.472

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.473

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.474

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.475

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.476

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.477

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.478

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.479

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.480

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.481

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.482

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.483

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.484

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.485

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.486

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.487

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.488

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.489

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.490

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.491

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.492

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.493

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.494

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.495

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.496

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.497

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.498

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.499

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.500

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.501

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.502

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.503

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.504

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.505

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.506

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.507

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.508

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.509

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.510

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.511

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.512

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.513

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.514

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.515

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.516

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.517

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.518

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.519

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.520

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.521

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.522

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.523

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.524

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.525

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.526

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.527

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.528

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.529

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.530

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.531

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.532

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.533

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.534

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.535

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.536

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.537

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.538

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.539

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.540

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.541

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.542

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.543

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.544

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.545

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.546

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.547

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.548

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.549

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.550

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.551

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.552

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.553

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.554

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.555

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.556

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.557

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.558

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.559

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.560

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.561

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.562

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.563

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.564

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.565

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.566

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.567

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.568

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.569

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.570

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.571

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.572

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.573

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.574

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.575

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.576

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.577

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.578

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.579

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.580

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.581

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.582

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.583

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.584

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.585

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.586

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.587

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.588

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.589

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.590

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.591

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.592

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.593

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.594

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.595

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.596

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.597

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.598

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.599

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.600

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.601

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.602

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.603

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.604

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.605

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.606

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.607

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.608

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.609

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.610

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.611

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.612

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.613

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.614

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.615

Mr. Callahan. Thank you, Commissioner.

Did you say you needed \$100 million for the grant program; is that what you were suggesting? Is that the number you used?

Secretary Norton. That is correct. That is not from this subcommittee's account.

Mr. Callahan. That is not?

Secretary Norton. Correct.

SALTON SEA

Mr. Callahan. Some of the members of the subcommittee had the opportunity to visit the Salton Sea in Southern California this January, and they have a very interesting program--and perhaps it comes under Reclamation--whereby they were filtering water that was pouring into the Salton Sea.

As you know, the Salton Sea is beginning to die as a result of salinity levels. But the program which we visited and witnessed was just a program of straining the water through natural means, which they seemed optimistic would truly have a very favorable impact on the cleansing of that sea. I, for one, am interested in helping them. Congressman Duncan Hunter invited us to look at that area, and he is requesting a pretty good amount of money to build additional filtering ponds.

I am wondering, are you familiar, Commissioner, or are you, Madam Secretary, with that program?

Secretary Norton. I am generally familiar with that. I have been to that area, although I have not gone to that specific project. I have talked with Congresswoman Bono, as well as Congressman Duncan Hunter, about the Salton Sea. It is a difficult issue because that area does not have the direct supply of water from the Colorado River. Of course, we already have the intense scarcity of water in the allocation from the Colorado River, but I believe that there are other things that can be done to enhance the Salton Sea ecosystem through the wetlands restoration and other types of activities.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, we are heavily involved in looking at the Salton Sea and trying to find a solution there to its continued salinization. Answering that whole problem is part of our program. It is called the California 4.4 program, where we are trying to get California back within its original allocation of 4.4 million acre-feet Colorado River water.

We are looking at a number of alternatives. The one that you had a chance to visit was in the Alamo River and New River area, and that certainly has promise, but we are looking at a number of alternatives that we could consider to help solve the problem. Certainly, one of the questions to answer is what is the solution? In other words, where are we trying to get to?

We are looking at a tight schedule for all of the States

involved for our studies. The first one of those reports is due back to you folks in April, and we are certainly working on that very closely.

Mr. Callahan. I do not pretend to be an expert on this, and you all are, but it is only logical to assume that if they are cleansing that water, what limited amount of water that is pouring in there, through the New River and others, that at least it is contributing to the cleansing of the Sea. It may not be sufficient to accomplish the goal we all want to accomplish, but if you are cleansing a gallon of water, and you expanded the program to cleanse 1,000 gallons of water, even before you settled the Colorado River problem, you are contributing to the betterment of the Sea. And I do not know how much room they have for expansion, but it appears to me that there is plenty of room for expansion.

Have you actually seen, Commissioner, the filtering system that they have installed?

Mr. Keys. I have not been to that one, sir, but I have seen a similar one that they are looking at in another area.

It is called an enhanced evaporation system and it does have a lot of promise. The only problem is that it produces small amounts of water, and it is very expensive. But it is one of the alternatives that we are looking at.

Mr. Callahan. My observation was this was just existing runoff from, I guess, irrigation overflows, that was cleansed of all of the fertilizer from the farming community. And the levels of purity at the end of this cleansing pond was very dramatic. I think last year we put some money in our bill to allow them to continue their program. But I just wondered, if you are going to start giving out \$100-million grants, this is a proven, albeit it might not be the total solution, it is a proven accomplishment in the right direction.

Secretary Norton. Mr. Chairman, the \$100 million Cooperative Conservation Initiative would be available for things like that. It would build upon partnerships and help create partnerships so that any Federal funding would be matched, and hopefully matched several times over, by the involvement of local Governments, and private organizations, and so forth.

Certainly, in the Salton Sea area there is so much interest in the local communities, for example the Palm Springs area. I think that kind of program, encouraging the amplification of the types of activities you are talking about, would be very helpful.

We also definitely have some water supply issues that are very difficult in the Salton Sea and the Southern California area.

Mr. Callahan. The rules prohibit us from inviting members outside of the Appropriations Committee to sit on this panel, but I did send a message to Congressman Hunter, and he is chairing an Armed Services hearing at this moment. But if he gets back, I would like to give him the opportunity to describe the system that we witnessed to you all and to ask you to come and look at it sometime during the spring or the early summer, so this committee can look at his request to see if this is a viable beginning of a solution to the salinity levels of the Salton Sea.

Thank you. Mr. Visclosky

Mr. Visclosky's Opening Remarks

Mr. Visclosky. Madam Secretary, thank you very much for being here. Commissioner, thank you also.

CALFED

On CALFED, Madam Secretary, it is my understanding we still do not have authorization for that program, and you have legislation pending in the House and the Senate. Does the administration have a position on either of those legislative vehicles?

Secretary Norton. We have testified as to both the House and the Senate's legislation, and I would be happy to provide you copies of that testimony.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.616

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.617

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.618

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.619

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.620

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.621

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.622

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.623

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.624

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.625

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.626

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.627

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.628

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.629

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.630

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.631

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.632

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.633

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.634

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.635

Secretary Norton. Overall, we support trying to find solutions in that area. And the type of process that CALFED has evolved into, trying to bring together all of the various interests, trying to come up with a comprehensive approach is something that I think is very beneficial. As you pointed out, it has not been authorized. The proposed spending that we have in this year's budget is helpful in moving us in the direction of CALFED, but is being used within existing statutory authorities.

Mr. Visclosky. If I could follow up on that point, for fiscal year 2002, the committee provided \$30 million for CALFED, even though there is no authorization. Am I correct on that?

Secretary Norton. It was, again, the same type of situation where \$30 million, I believe, went to CALFED-type activities, but was used within the existing authorities of the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies.

Mr. Visclosky. But for fiscal year 2001, the committee provided no funds because it was the position of the chair at that time, which I agreed with, is if you did not have authorization to, with some specificity, outline the agreements reached and the long-term solutions sought, that we ought to defer funding.

There was no authorization in 2001, and no monies were spent, but we apparently have contemporaneous authorization which we are using to spend \$30 million this year. I would go one year further back in time, it is my recollection that we appropriated \$60 million for CALFED in fiscal year 2000. All of those monies were not obligated in 2000, and some of those funds, and I would ask if the Commissioner has a figure, how many of those were actually spent in 2001, when there was no authorization provided or were those pursuant to previous authorization?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Visclosky, we would supply those numbers for the record, but certainly any of those funds spent after the year 2000 were spent within our existing authorizations and not the one that ran out.

[The information follows:]

Carryover Expenditures in the Bay-Delta

The California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement Act, P.L. 104-333, Title XI, authorized certain environmental activities, many of which were projects that were to take several years to accomplish. Because appropriations were only authorized for three years, projects selected were fully funded. Many of these projects are continuing to be constructed, so the unexpended carryover is necessary to insure project completion. Carryover of \$18.8 million from the previous three years' appropriations was expended in Fiscal Year 2001, leaving \$37.0 million to be expended under P.L. 104-333.

Mr. Visclosky. So we would only be talking about the \$30 million for 2002 being spent in an unauthorized fashion, but apparently justified, given the existing authorization for other types of activities.

Mr. Keys. That is correct.

Secretary Norton. We have the CVPIA authorization, as well

as other types of statutes that are the basis for our activities in that area.

Mr. Visclosky. Madam Secretary, I would ask, for the record, if the panel could provide, with detail, the authorizations you relied on for the expenditure of the \$30 million for the current fiscal year and the authorization on which the \$15 million requested for this coming fiscal year are based.

But I would ask now, if we are in the second year of these expenditures, without having a resolution of the authorizing legislation, why bother?

Secretary Norton. First of all, we would be happy to provide you with that detailed documentation.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.636

Secretary Norton. Secondly, there are issues such as the Tracy Fish Test facility, which is a part of the funding that we are seeking, and that is something that is necessary. Basically, it is the pump that connects the Northern California Water and the Southern California water needs, and there is concern about the impact of that pumping on fish populations. That is something that needs to be addressed, whether it is done under the auspices of the CALFED program or under our regular management responsibilities. There are a number of other things that are similar to that, in terms of just being the types of things that we ought to be doing as part of our responsibilities.

The Environmental Water Account is another example of that. While that is often included, as people talk about CALFED, that is something that assists the Bureau of Reclamation in meeting its responsibilities to irrigated agriculture, as well as meeting its environmental responsibilities.

Mr. Visclosky. One of the concerns, as far as not having the authorization, is in the Commissioner's testimony, and he also orally recited it. We are concerned about water quality, there is no disagreement on that, and habitat, and ecological functions. I do not recall what the language of our report was for fiscal year 2002, but my recollection was, in earlier years, this subcommittee also expressed great concern about having balance between users, as well as environmental projects. And I do not think, again, any of us would disagree that monies ought to be set aside for environmental restoration. But my sense, on the face of it, looking at the request now, is that there is a skewing of these dollars in that respect, as opposed to the end users, and that, short of a compromise and agreement finally being forced on this issue, we will continue to kind of go along funding discrete programs.

My question is why bother? My further question is, if you do not receive funds, maybe people will come to the table and resolve some of these long-term problems that, apparently, lack of pressure of no money has allowed them simply to ignore.

Secretary Norton. Certainly, that balance between the users and the environment is something that is at the heart of the CALFED debate. It is an issue that we are concerned about. That is part of the balance that has been addressed in our previous testimony on that legislation.

There are always issues on environmental impacts that we

need to be concerned about as we are going forward with our operations, and while we would like to see the overall balance resolved with legislation, we think it does make sense to continue on with some of these activities pending that.

Mr. Visclosky. I see my time is up. Mr. Hunter is here, but I would simply close by suggesting that if some pressure is not brought to bear on these negotiations, for example no funds until we have an authorization for a clearly defined long-term program that is balanced between users and the environment, we are going to find ourselves in 12 months, again, talking about discrete sums of money with current authorization and the problem remaining unresolved.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Visclosky, if you look at our 2003 request, almost half of that money is directed toward looking at studies for expansion of storage; in other words, looking at Shasta enlargement at the San Joaquin River Basin Study, the Las Vaqueros expansion and that sort of thing.

So there is a balance there. While it may not be one-for-one, it is pretty close.

Mr. Visclosky. I appreciate your answer.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hunter and Salton Sea

Mr. Callahan. With the indulgence of the committee, I wonder if I could take just 3 or 4 minutes to facilitate Mr. Hunter. Let me inform you, Congressman, that the rules prohibit you from questioning the panelists, but for your information, Commissioner Keys is the head of the Bureau of Reclamation and Secretary Norton, of course, is the Secretary of the Interior.

I was explaining to them the visit by me and some of the members of this panel, this subcommittee, to the Salton Sea in January, and the interest that developed as a result of what we witnessed with the cleansing through the ponds. Secretary Norton had requested \$100 million in grant funding, and I was questioning here as to whether or not your program would comply.

So, if you could tell the committee, whereby the Commissioner and the Secretary can hear what you are saying, just briefly something about the program there and what you are seeking to do.

Mr. Hunter's Statement

Mr. Hunter. Certainly. Mr. Chairman, thank you. This is very kind of you to give me an opportunity just to make a statement or two about the sea, and then you might want to reflect on that.

If you are familiar with the Salton Sea, the big body of water that is just there north of the Mexican border. It is a huge recreation resource for the working folks in California, within driving distance of L.A., San Bernardino and the inland empire, about 6 percent of the country's population, a great fishery, and now, because it does not have an outflow, it has become increasingly saline, and the chairman is working to try to develop a system that will allow us to arrest the salinity. It is now about 40,000 parts per million salt. When it gets to

60,000, the sea dies and becomes like the great Salt Lake or the Dead Sea, and so we are working that problem hard.

It is fed by the New River, which flows north from Mexico for about 60 miles and goes into the south end of the sea. It is basically run-off water from the agricultural operations in the Mexicali Valley in Mexico and the Imperial Valley in the United States, and it brings in a lot of sewage effluent from Mexicali.

These marshes, we have come up with this way of cleansing the New River, which is now considered the most polluted river in the country, by flowing it through a series of marshes, which do extract contaminants. And we have got our first marshes in place--it is a great project done by the Bureau of Reclamation with a group of ours called Desert Wildlife Unlimited who built the watering holes for the big horn sheep out in the Valley.

This process, as the chairman noted when he was out there, extracts about 97 percent of the contaminants by flowing the river, pulling water out of the river, flowing it through marshes and then down into the river. Our goal is to have 60 miles of wildlife marshes, which would be an enormous expansion of wetlands and provide great recreational opportunities, and would clean that water before it gets into the Salton Sea.

We still have, of course, a salinity problem with the sea, and we need your help to continue to work a program to arrest that salinity at about 40,000 parts per million. Otherwise we are going to obviously have a Dead Sea in a matter of years.

So, Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I look forward to working with you on this project.

Salton Sea Alternatives

Mr. Callahan. Do you have any response, either of you, to what I said and he said with regard to this, as to some direction we, as a committee, could take to assist in this matter? Do you have any suggestions?

Other than the \$100 million he asked for. [Laughter.]

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we put about \$2.5 million during 2002 into the demonstration project that Mr. Hunter was talking about, and we have monies in 2003, about a million, to follow up on that.

That is one of the alternatives that we are looking at to try to do some good there in the Salton Sea, but there are a number of others that we are also considering. During this year, 2002, we expect to identify a number of alternatives to consider there. I would propose that we bring that report to you and walk through it with you to show you what those alternatives are, and then let us try to make a decision among us on what is the best way to go on it.

Mr. Callahan. The big question here is whether or not this committee should earmark some money specifically for this project in our instructions or suggestions to you in the report language so we could really expedite the additional ponds that they are suggesting. We need to get this thing through the study phase and into a reality phase, and we need your cooperation, as well as your cooperation, Madam Secretary, to expedite the additional areas of potential there.

Secretary Norton. Mr. Chairman, we are studying from a senior management level what to do with the Salton Sea issue and have not yet reached any final conclusions. We also have a Fish and Wildlife Service refuge that is in that area, and part of the Cooperative Conservation Initiative that I mentioned does go to the Fish and Wildlife Service for cooperative activities in its area. We have both the State side of that program and the Fish and Wildlife Service side of that program available for helping to build partnerships to help address issues of that nature.

We also have a \$56 million increase in the funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service refuge operations nationwide. Again, while that does not specifically address the Salton Sea, those are resources that, as the Fish and Wildlife Service is involved in looking at these issues, we might be able to draw upon to help resolve issues there as well.

Mr. Callahan. Well, and I know that there is additional money for studies, but, if the levels of purity are increased from 6-percent to 97-percent purity under this pilot program that is taking place, I do not know why we need a study to determine whether or not this is contributing to the betterment of the Salton Sea.

Maybe there are other alternatives. Maybe there are more rapid alternatives, but this is the only thing that I have seen that is making any significant improvement in the quality of water pouring into the sea. In any event, maybe the solution is for you and the Commissioner to get with Congressman Hunter and then back to us and suggest what we can do to facilitate your two agencies into providing the resources that are necessary to expedite or to expand greatly the progress that has already been developed there, a lot of it with local money and with local contributions of time and effort. That is what we ought to encourage.

Mr. Pastor. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Callahan. Sure.

Mr. Pastor's Comments on Gila River

Mr. Pastor. The Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, has an ongoing demonstration project in the Gila River, which is west of Phoenix, Arizona, and they have taken effluent water and other waters and have been dealing with marshes and other vegetation in the effort to reclaim water so it can be used for other purposes. So I would suggest to the Chairman and extend an invitation to you and Congressman Duncan Hunter that it might be something that you want to look at, and assist to move the project faster, because this demonstration project has been in existence for at least 4 years that I know of, and it has been very successful. And so I bring it up to your attention because it may be something that you may want to look at.

Mr. Callahan. Well, it is something that I, personally, am interested in, and I need some suggestion from the two of you as to what we can do to expand this program here and in Arizona, because these are proven projects. And while we go through study, after study, after study trying to find a better way, why not go ahead, in some manner, and expand what we know

is working. It may not be a total solution, but it is a step in the right direction.

SALTON SEA

So I appreciate the indulgence of the committee. Congressman Hunter, we will certainly look at your request. He floored me yesterday when he suggested \$100 million.

Mr. Hunter. I like to come in low, Mr. Chairman.
[Laughter.]

Mr. Callahan. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and to my colleagues, thanks for indulging me in this opportunity to come in and talk about this important issue. Thank you, Madam Secretary. I look forward to working with you. Appreciate it.

Mr. Callahan. So will you, the two of you or your staff, begin working with Congressman Hunter to submit something suggesting to us as a committee as to which direction we ought to take on this?

Secretary Norton. We will be happy to talk with Congressman Hunter about that. I, again, caution that this is an issue that involves the water rights or the water usage of the irrigators and of the municipalities in that area, so it has a lot to do with the allocation of water as we try to move into the 4.4 plan, and so it is complex in many aspects.

Mr. Hunter. Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment on that. I will not ask a question, but make a comment on that point.

With respect to the sea, the Salton Sea, and what is going to happen with that big basin of water when water transfers are made from the Imperial Valley to the metropolitan areas, the sea receding and thereby becoming more saline is an issue that obviously involves water rights' aspects of the transfer and also the environmental issues that are driven by that.

But for the New River, this river that flows out of Mexico and flows into the sea, the ponds that we are building, the marshes we are creating, the wetlands we are creating have no such ramifications. Whether that is more water or less water, it is still very dirty water with all of that sewage in it. And so pulling the sewage pollution out of that water accrues nobody's detriment.

The issues of the sea receding and the water transfer is an issue, and that is one issue, Madam Secretary, that you folks are going to need to look at because the Imperial Irrigation District has been sued in the past for not conserving water, that is, for not lining its canals, not having pump-back systems for the irrigation, and they now are going to be doing those things and sending some of that conserved water to the cities.

They are now threatened with being sued if they do conserve water because environmentalists are saying you have to keep putting that runoff water into the sea to keep the sea high. So we are going to sue you for billions if you start conserving water, and you have got the cities saying we are going to sue you if you do not conserve water.

And we have legislation that says that we have got a limited amount of liability to accrue to these agencies. If these agencies are bankrupted by lawsuits, there is not going to be a

transfer. In fact, their contracts of transfer all have conditions in them saying if our liability for the environmental impact goes over \$20 million in the case of the IID, and I think it is \$10 million for Metropolitan, we are out of there. The contract is dead.

So it is very important for everybody that needs water and also likes conservation in California to support some limitation of liability because these guys are caught in a vice. They are going to be sued if they conserve, they are going to be sued if they do not conserve. So we need your help there too.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that time.

Mr. Callahan. It might be an interesting trip for this subcommittee to take. I know that we are going to look at some projects in Arizona, and we are going to look at some projects in Southern California. So maybe it would be a good idea for the committee to witness what some of us saw this past January.

In any event, if you all will contact Congressman Hunter, and if you all then will give to us some suggestion as to where we can get the money, how much money is really needed to expedite the expansion of this program, it will be appreciated.

Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Edwards.

Mr. Edwards. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Hunter leaves, I just want to point out, in fairness to him, that any of our colleagues who might think \$100 million is asking for a lot, for these Armed Services Committee guys, that is a rounding error. [Laughter.]

Mr. Hunter. I would never say one fighter aircraft. [Laughter.]

Mr. Edwards. Thank you. I was going to yield more time of my time, if the gentleman needed it, to finish any statements.

Mr. Hunter. No, I appreciate it. Again, I thank my colleagues for the indulgence, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, and you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Edwards. Thank you.

Mr. Edward's Opening Remarks

Secretary Norton, Commissioner Keys, thank you both for being here and for all you do. A lot of Americans do not realize the incredible impact of this Department, this Agency upon so many lives.

LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY STUDY

I would just like to ask a broad question. We have the Army Corps of Engineers that has responsibilities for flood control. The Bureau of Reclamation certainly has a multiplicity of roles, one important one is obviously water supply. Do you and/or the Army Corps of Engineers work together or have you or has anyone in the Federal Government done any kind of a long-term study of where our Nation is in terms of water supply? To bring it back to the very, very basics, our population is growing very significantly. I do not know the exact numbers over the last 10 years with the new census, but it was a significant increase.

To my knowledge, the Army Corps of Engineers, in most areas of the country, and the Bureau of Reclamation are not building

new dams. Have we done studies to determine that water conservation and other efforts are going to be enough to provide the water needs for our country 20 years from now, or is there no one Federal agency with the responsibility to look at those long-term water needs, not just for the Western States, but for the entire country?

Secretary Norton. We have certainly been giving thought to that from our own Department's perspective, and we work with the Bureau of Reclamation on a lot of things; for example, on our security issues. We have worked jointly on counterterrorism, but I am not aware of any sort of Nationwide study effort.

John?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Edwards, we work very closely with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Secretary talked about the security things. Reclamation, the Corps, and TVA have cooperated to the ultimate in the challenges that have been put before us over the past 6 months.

We work regularly with both of those agencies on our Safety of Dams program. We work in the Pacific Northwest and the Western United States with them on environmental issues so that our facilities are coordinated and so forth. So we work very closely with them now.

In taking a look into the future, there have been some studies in the past. There was a Western Water Policy Review; I just deal in the 17 Western States, but that is the study that we worked with a lot of agencies a few years ago in looking at what water policies we need to take us into the future.

There are other agencies that we work with, also. We work very closely with the USGS, Geological Survey, in our own Department, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Edwards. It sounds like maybe in your 17 States you look at, perhaps, long-term water needs. If there is a report, I would love to see a copy of that. In the House we are reelected for 2-year terms, the Secretaries are appointed 4 years or 8 years, if they serve out their full terms. I am just wondering who, in our Government, is looking at 20-year or 30-year water needs.

With Ms. Roybal-Allard here, I should probably be hesitant to use the California energy situation as an analogy because there were a lot of complicated factors and different causes for their shortage, but to some there was a fundamental supply/demand problem. You had a growing economy and a growing population in California, but energy capacity was not being increased.

I see the same thing nationally, whether that analogy is good or not, I see that occurring nationally. We have got millions of new Americans in the population, and yet I do not know when the Army Corps of Engineers built a new dam to collect water. I do not know how many you have built in the last decade or so or how many are planned for the next decade in terms of water supply. At some point, supply and demand catches up to you.

Are we going to drain our aquifers? Perhaps there is a report that says we can have so many improvements in the efficient use of water through conservation, retreating water, to solve the problem. I have just never seen anyone in the

Government look at, or maybe I hoped someone had looked at 20-year water needs for the country, just drinking water, if nothing else.

Are we adequately prepared for that? If not, I would think the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation would be two agencies to play some role in encouraging a long-term water supply need for the country.

Secretary Norton. I think your point on needing to plan ahead is a very good one, and I think there are many areas of the country that are beginning to realize that water is an issue that really needs to figure into their planning processes.

There is a National Academy of Sciences study of water resources research that is going to commence. The USGS is currently working on the scope of that and expects to finalize a contract in May of this year with the National Academy of Sciences. I need to find out whether that addresses the kind of question you are posing.

Mr. Edwards. I realize this is not exactly your responsibility, but if you could have your staff follow up on that, I would be interested to hear about it.

Secretary Norton. I would be happy to do that.

[The information follows:]

Long-Term Water Supply Studies

In the FY 2002 appropriations language for the Department of the Interior, House Report 107-103, the Congress directed the U.S. Geological Survey to ``prepare a report describing the scope and magnitude of the efforts needed to provide periodic assessments of the status and trends in the availability and use of freshwater resources''.

The Congress also directed USGS to contract with the National Academy of Sciences ``to examine water resources research funded by all Federal agencies and by significant non-Federal organizations'', and ``to consider the level and allocation of resources that are currently deployed in water research programs, both Federal and non-Federal, and provide recommendations for a national research program that maximizes the efficiency and effectiveness of existing programs. While the primary focus of this study deals with the existing research agenda, the managers would like an answer to the question of whether the Nation is making an adequate level of investment in water resources research'', H. Report 107-243. USGS is negotiating a statement of work with the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council regarding the content and scope of the requested study. The completed study will probably not be available for another 2 years.

Mr. Edwards. Thank you. Thank you, both.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Callahan Calls for Short Recess

Mr. Callahan. There is a vote on the floor, which is why all of the members left, but I am going to have to run and vote, too, Madam Secretary. I hate to have you sit here idly during this 10 or 15 minutes it takes to get over there and back, but with your indulgence, we are going to have to recess for just a second. We will be right back.

[Recess.]

Mr. Frelinghuysen's Opening Remarks

Mr. Frelinghuysen [presiding]. Madam Secretary, good morning still. Chairman Callahan has allowed me to ask a few questions as he comes back from the vote.

New York and New Jersey Highlands

Good morning. Thank you for being here. I apologize for being late. I would like to discuss an issue unrelated to the Bureau of Reclamation. It is probably as far away from the Salton Sea as you can possibly be, but since I have the microphone and the gavel, I guess I have the right to talk about a land preservation project in both New York and New Jersey known as the New York and New Jersey Highlands.

This, in our part of the Northeast, is one of the most threatened and one of our most important watersheds for people in the New York-New Jersey region. We are talking about 4 million people. And this is basically a forested property area that is under the gun in terms of development, and certainly our States combined, at least in my region, are probably the most densely populated part of the U.S. In the Northeast, as you are aware, we are undergoing drought conditions all up and down the East Coast. I guess with the exception of Florida, we have had some incredible problems.

Currently, the U.S. Forest Service, is updating a study of the New York and New Jersey Highlands region, and the draft is due to be released in mid-March. Last year, in the Interior appropriations bill, the committee requested that both the Departments of Interior and Agriculture review the findings of the study, and I quote, ``Report to the Appropriations Committee on ways in which the Federal Government can partner with State, county and private efforts to preserve critical lands within this national significant area in the Northeast.''. It has been recognized nationally by the Federal Government, actually, since the early 1990s.

Besides the fact that we would love to have you come to the region, I was hoping that you would perhaps briefly comment on our hopes and aspirations to preserve as much of this area as possible.

Secretary Norton. Thank you, Congressman.

It is my understanding that we have been working with the Forest Service and exploring options on this approach. I would be happy to come, when my schedule allows, to take a look at the area.

We are trying to work on a number of different cooperative approaches for preserving areas of environmental benefit, and some of the programs that we are discussing in our overall budget proposals, like our Cooperative Conservation Initiative, might be helpful in this area. Recognizing the need for preservation of resources on private lands have also pursued, in some other areas, conservation easements or agreements so that the resources can be preserved in a cooperative way, working with States and local Governments.

So there are a whole array of different options that might

be brought to bear to design something that would be appropriate for the area.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. We would welcome your participation and your assistance in taking advantage of any of those options. We know that around the country, not in the Northeast, there is lot of resistance. But in the East, where we are under so much pressure, and where certainly a massive part of our population lives, we salute the work you do, and we would love to have your greater involvement and assistance.

Thank you.

Secretary Norton. Thank you.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. Mr. Visclosky?

Mr. Visclosky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Operation and Maintenance Backlog

Mr. Commissioner, what is your critical maintenance backlog on O&M for hydroelectric facilities at your dams? Do you know?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Visclosky, we take great pride in our power plants. To the best of my knowledge, we do not have a backlog. We use our monies judiciously to keep those up. We have agreements with Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest, where we use their monies up front to do that work. We are currently working on the same sort of agreements with Western Area Power Administration so that we have those monies at the time we need them to keep our power facilities up-to-date and on-line.

Mr. Visclosky. So you do not have an O&M backlog then?

Mr. Keys. For our power plants, that is correct.

Mr. Visclosky. Let me ask you this: If you had additional funds, what improvements or investments could be made at some of these Federal facilities to improve their efficiencies?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Visclosky, there are a number of things that we could do, of course. We are currently looking at a number of additions, upgrades, rewinds and that sort of thing for our system as part of the President's energy policy. We are looking at a thing in California, at Folsom, called a ``powerformer,'' where we get away from having to have the oil-filled transformers at the facilities. Certainly we could speed this up. We are looking at the possibilities of putting small power plants on those facilities we have that do not have power plants on them.

So we could make use of additional monies in upgrading, rewinding, and speeding up some of the programs that we are working on now.

Mr. Visclosky. Mr. Commissioner, could you provide for the record a list of these potential projects, what their cost estimate, what their benefit would be.

Mr. Keys. Yes, sir, we can do that.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.637

Mr. Visclosky. I appreciate that. Last year we had an amendment for the Corps to try to facilitate some of these improvements in the area of energy efficiency, so I appreciate that.

Counterterrorism and Physical Security

Madam Secretary, on counterterrorism and physical security, in the supplemental, I believe we had \$31 million, and your stated need was \$75 million. In this year's budget request, it is \$26.6 million. What is your unfunded need, as far as security and counterterrorism?

Secretary Norton. This is primarily one that would allow us to provide the ongoing personnel needs for security at our dams. That has been the primary need, and so we have increased the manpower, and this would allow us to continue that.

Let me turn to John Trezise to provide you some more detail with that.

Mr. Trezise. Thank you, Secretary Norton.

Mr. Visclosky, the 2003 budget for the Bureau of Reclamation basically continues the recurring activities which were funded as part of the counterterrorism supplemental such as additional guard service, physical security improvements.

I think it does enable us to maintain that level of security. The Commissioner may want to address----

Mr. Visclosky. But for the supplemental, \$75 million were identified. You got \$31 million, which left you \$44 million, and you have asked for \$26 million.

Secretary Norton. Let me ask the Commissioner to address that. I think I know where some of that is.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Visclosky, the \$75 million was our first shot out of the box at what it would take over a long term to get done. The \$30 million that we are operating under this year got us started with getting the proper law enforcement people at the facilities, and paying salaries and so forth. It started the re-review of all of the security programs for every one of our facilities, and those are underway at this time.

They are being approached in a tiered approach. In other words, those most visible and prominent facilities are being addressed first, like Glen Canyon Dam, Hoover Dam, Shasta Dam, Grand Coulee Dam and so forth. The review of those security plans and needs will go all the way to the bottom dam; in other words, the small diversion dam out there. We do not know a lot of the changes that would be necessary or additions that we would have to do. The \$26 million that we have in the 2003 budget lets us continue those security reviews, and actually we would finish them up at the end of 2003 so that our 2004 proposal would include those changes or additional monies that we might need.

Mr. Visclosky. Have you, in your studies to date, identified physical changes that would need to take place, over and above law enforcement officials, that if you had the additional monies for security, you could make that investment in 2003?

Because I assume, recognizing there are different values placed on assets, as well as different levels of threat, that you would obviously have higher priorities and lower priorities. On that scale, have you identified some projects that will need to be accomplished and undertaken?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Visclosky, we identified some additional things early on to do at some of the facilities, like remote television cameras, more lighting, some bollards. Bollards come up out of the ground to prevent traffic from going into areas

that we are already implementing. These activities are being done within this funding that we have for 2002. We can do these activities within the monies that we have requested for 2003. Again, when we get through with the studies of security for each one of the facilities, we would then come back with those additional needs.

Secretary Norton. As the Commissioner is stating, most of the kinds of things we are talking about for dams are fairly small in terms of the capital investments. It is more the personnel kinds of issues. There are a few things that are related that are high-price tag, such as at Hoover Dam, the proposal to construct a bridge that would, instead of having traffic go on the top of the dam itself, would have a separate bridge built. That is obviously a Department of Transportation funding issue. We are supportive of that taking place.

Mr. Visclosky. There was some discussion like that for Folsom Dam, if I remember, also.

Secretary Norton. That is correct, yes. So there are those kinds of things, but as to the dams themselves, we are looking at personnel issues. One of the things that we want to explore is reaching agreements with other Federal law enforcement, or State, or local law enforcement agencies to perhaps provide some of the guard services, or cooperative law enforcement, that might meet those personnel-type needs. So we are exploring a number of options.

Mr. Visclosky. Money, obviously, is very, very tight. But if there are a couple of things that have been identified over and above the 26.6 million, if you could identify those for the record, because I would just hate, again, if the resources are available, to defer for another year, if it is possible to take some action, but I appreciate your responses.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

Additional Funding for Site Security or Counter Terrorism

The Bureau of Reclamation's budget for FY 2003 provides for \$26.6 million for physical security and counter-terrorism needs. At this time, we believe that amount of funding is adequate to carry out plans for that activity.

Mr. Callahan. Mr. Pastor?

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pastor's Opening Remarks

First of all, let me compliment the Bureau for the rapid response you have undertaken to protect our great infrastructure in the West, and I want to thank you for it.

TRES RIOS PROJECT

Let me go back to a conversation we had with Congressman Duncan Hunter and with the chairman. As you know, the Bureau has been very active in Phoenix with the Tres Rios project, where we are working with and reclaiming effluent. About 3 years ago, we do not know how, but we had a beaver show up, and

most recently we had to relocate a whole family and more because they found it ideal, living conditions.

We are of taking water that may not be usable, effluent water that has been contaminated by agriculture use, and going through a process that will restore the quality of the water and make it usable again for various purposes and at the same time restore, reconstruct and reclaim the environment and the water. I know that last year we had half a million dollars in the Tres Rios Project, and we wish to continue it, because we think it has become a model for how the Bureau of Reclamation and how other entities, cities, counties, can reclaim water.

Basically, the question is, to continue this project for fiscal year 2003, what is your best estimate that would allow us to continue that?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pastor, we currently have \$200,000 in our proposal that would be matched by the City of Phoenix. So we have about \$400,000 of authority there for 2003.

Mr. Pastor. I would extend an invitation to the chairman, and the ranking member, and the committee members, as you have said, you may want to go into Arizona. I would suggest that we look at this model project because I think it is going to be used. I think in Tucson they are looking at this model to reclaim water down in Southern Arizona in one of the rivers.

HOOVER DAM VISITORS CENTER

As I compliment you on the security for Hoover and Glen Canyon Dams in Arizona, I also must give you some constituent concerns. I have been meeting with my constituents, and mainly they are the power users, they are the water district users, and I will try to lay a foundation.

I have been told that the Visitors Center is now closed, for all practical purposes, at Hoover Dam.

Mr. Keys. No, sir.

Mr. Pastor. Well, I have been told that you can no longer take the \$20 tour, and that it has been said never again will we do the \$20 tour, which was, I guess, our biggest money maker.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Pastor, prior to September 11th, we had two different levels of tours into the dam. One of them was called the ``Hard Hat Tour'' that you are talking about.

Mr. Pastor. The Hard Hat tour, right, the \$20 one.

Mr. Keys. And it took people down into the very bowels of the power plant and the dam, into places that even in good times there was not a lot of comfort there, and there were some protections put in place.

With the events of September 11th and the recommendations from Sandia Natural Laboratory and so forth, that tour was closed. The Visitors Center itself was reopened about 3 weeks after September 11th. In December, we reopened a tour of the dam, and it is a much shortened tour that is not the Hard Hat tour. So there is only one tour available now.

Mr. Pastor. But that was one of the means that we were using to help finance the Financial Center, the construction of the Visitors Center, excuse me. And I was told, and I am not blaming you because it was not on your watch, that it was about \$100 million over budget, the construction of this Visitors

Center.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Pastor, I do not know the figure exactly, but----

Mr. Pastor. But it is in that ballpark.

Mr. Keys [continuing]. It is probably in the ballpark.

Mr. Pastor. It is in that ballpark.

Mr. Keys. Your assumption that revenues from the Visitor Center were going to try to pay for that is correct, also.

Mr. Pastor. What I am trying to establish, Mr. Chairman, is 15 years ago, 12 years ago, the agreement was made that the revenues generated by the Visitors Center would pay for the cost of constructing the Visitors Center, and at that time I think the estimate was that \$23 million would be the cost to build the Visitors Center. Because they found that, in order to build a Visitors Center and elevators in that beautiful structure that we have up there where the flag is, that cost grew to about \$100 million for the Bureau. Now, with the enhanced security, with the cost growth, they are going back to the users and saying you have to ginnie up. And they are saying, well, the problem is that we did not ask for the overruns, and now that the tour, and as you heard, the \$20 tour, which was the money maker, at least the potential of making money, is no longer available, that we are losing or we probably will lose revenues in that particular area.

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pastor----

Mr. Pastor. And I am not blaming you. I am just bringing it up because they have come to me and are asking for solutions.

Mr. Keys. Sir, your folks are asking the same questions that we are asking ourselves right now. Before September 11th, we were generating about \$14 million a year in revenue from visitations to the Visitors Center and in those tours there. Since September 11th, since we have been back into operation, it appears that that is going to be cut about in half.

We are struggling right now with how to accommodate that difference in income. The payment of security, the additional security after September 11 is something that we are also taking a hard look at.

ADDITIONAL SECURITY COSTS AT HOOVER DAM

Mr. Pastor. How much money do you think the additional costs are just for security on Hoover Dam since 9/11?

Mr. Keys. I can get you a figure for that because I do not have that right on the tip of my tongue, but Reclamation is different from a lot of the other agencies in that a lot of our expenditures are reimbursable, as your folks are telling you from the hydropower side. The same is true of a lot of our irrigation facilities.

[The information follows:]

Additional Security Costs At Hoover Dam

There have been extra security related expenses for FY 2002 for Hoover Dam that have been required after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. These costs include the following in FY 2002: \$1,052,000 for non-law enforcement personnel costs, \$2,959,000 for law enforcement personnel costs, and \$1,047,000 for security related

equipment and enhancements. The total of these additional security costs in FY 2002 is \$5,058,000. Additional security costs are expected to vary in FY 2003 and beyond.

Mr. Keys. We are now looking at the reimbursability of all of those monies and have asked those questions of our solicitors and have not received an answer yet, but we are taking a hard look at it. The lack of income there at the Visitor facility is part of that look that we are doing at what security is costing us.

Secretary Norton. If I can also add, since I went to see Hoover Dam and the new tour that was reopened. It still allows visitors a great opportunity to see inside the dam and to see the power facilities and so forth. It is still a very worthwhile tour for people to do, but it avoids the security concerns that we had with the Hard Hat Tour. I am comfortable that we are now at the appropriate level of balancing visitor interest versus the security, and I do not anticipate that changing.

Mr. Pastor. I think the concern is, again, that because added security is bringing additional cost, the tours have been modified so that the revenues that would have been generated are lessened, that now you have additional cost that you say is reimbursable. But the bodies that you may look to are saying, ``We are pretty maxed out of what we can do, and we may not be the purse to be able to fund these, '' and so you get, and I will make them available in the record, resolutions coming out of various agencies. This is the Colorado River Energy Distributors saying that we need to look for unreimbursable monies to be paying for these shortfalls. Another resolution that comes from the Colorado River Energy Distributors, again, resolving to the same conclusion.

I will make, for the record, a letter that explains that back in the 1940s, when we were involved with the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the Bureau of Reclamation had to deal again with security issues at Hoover and other dams, and at that time the Commissioner was asking for nonreimbursable funds. So I think that our constituents are going to be looking to us to see how we could find nonreimbursable funds to meet these added needs that we have at the Hoover Dam and other facilities.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.638

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.639

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.640

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.641

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.642

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.643

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.644

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.645

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.646

Mr. Keys. Mr. Pastor, we will keep working with them, and as the decisions are made on whether they are reimbursable or not, we will keep you informed so that if we need some help, we will know where to come for it.

Mr. Pastor. I am sure you will and they will keep us informed.

REORGANIZATION OF BIA

To the Secretary, welcome, and congratulations on your appointment. Again, a concern that does not deal with the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, but my tribal leaders have come over to see me a number of times now, and they want to work with you in the reorganization of BIA. And they are asking that they be allowed to provide more input, share some of their knowledge, so that the BIA, in its restructuring, there will be an opportunity for them and for you. So I just bring it to your attention because they have asked me to bring it to your attention.

Secretary Norton. Thank you. We do look forward to working with them. We have a task force of tribal leaders that is analyzing a number of different options for reorganization. We want to get the tribal input and we are working to get that, but we would certainly look for any other avenues you might suggest.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you very much.

HOOVER DAM VISITORS CENTER COST OVERRUN

Mr. Callahan. Just a brief observation. I cannot fathom a \$100-million cost overrun over \$23 million. Number one, I guess everybody in their lifetime has visited the dam and visited the Visitors Center, but I cannot fathom how there could possibly be \$100-million cost overrun, and I suppose that the solution to that, Ed, would be to ask GAO to give us a report on how a cost overrun of that respect, of that degree could possibly be a reality.

We would ask, Bob, if you all would ask GAO to give us a report on the proposed cost overrun and the funding as well. You cannot enter into a contract with people, based upon an assumption that is existing, and then remove the capability of funding and expect them to pay for it. We cannot do that. You do not do that anywhere, and you are going to be facing some liability suit if you do.

But that is something we, first, I think must find out where we are going with respect to this \$100 million, and what it is for, and then ask GAO to give us an accountability of how we fund this, even the first \$23 million.

Secretary Norton. I believe that there has already been some GAO analysis of the construction. We will be happy to collect that information and provide some more information to you.

Mr. Callahan. Very good.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.647

Mr. Callahan. Mrs. Roybal-Allard?

Ms. Roybal-Allard's Opening Remarks

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Welcome, Madam Secretary and Commissioner.

CALIFORNIA 4.4 PLAN

As you know, California is in a situation right now where it has to reduce its use of the Colorado River and its dependence on that water. The Department of Interior is playing a key role in the implementation of the plan that has been put forward. Could you please tell me what the status of that plan is, whether you think that California will be able to meet that deadline, and also if there are any budget implications with regards to implementing the plan?

Secretary Norton. The Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Bennett Raley, as well as John Keys, have been working closely with the entities in the Southern California area on the 4.4 plan, as well as other California water issues, including CALFED. So we are working very closely with all of those groups. Obviously, it is a difficult challenge because we are trying to make scarce water go more different ways, but we will work with them.

I believe that the 4.4 plan is something that has to be done. We have to continue carrying out that process. I think that the process that has been arrived at over the work of the last several years is something that we want to continue because it has reached the right kind of balance.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. So, at this point, you do not anticipate any problems in being able to, what is it, a 15-year----

Mr. Keys. Excuse me. It is a 13-year program.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. We now have a 13-year program?

Mr. Keys. There is a definite schedule laid out within that 13 years, and so far we are on schedule. Are there problems? Yes, ma'am, there will be problems all the way along that we will work very closely to solve, but so far we are on schedule. The first report is due out in April, and everything set forth.

I would sum up the commitment that we have to the 4.4 plan in saying that ``failure is not an option.''

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Especially for California. I think you are aware of the impact it would have on California if we are not successful.

TITLE XVI PROGRAM

One of the efforts that California has undertaken towards reducing its reliance on Colorado River water has been its recycling and reuse projects. That is why I am concerned that there is a significant decline for the Bureau's water recycling and reuse projects in the budget request.

In California, this has helped us to be able to increase our use of water for such things as watering grass and golf courses. Businesses depend heavily on that water because it is reliable and something that they can use. In fact, 30 percent of the water in Los Angeles County is currently recycled water.

My understanding is that one of the barriers to even greater use of recycled water is the lack of infrastructure.

I am a little confused. Being that we have this goal, I am not sure I understand why the Department budget does not reflect the need to continue to have recycling and reuse projects.

Mr. Keys. Ms. Allard, the Title XVI program is very important to us. We are right now trying to finish up those projects that we have already started. Certainly, the request that we have made in this year's budget or appropriations request is almost the same that we made last year, even though the funding that we received was more.

Basically, we are trying to stay within the limitations of a limited budget by making that same request that we made last year.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. To pay for all of the Title XVI projects that are currently underway, what amount would you need?

Mr. Keys. My financial manager just told me that we are ahead of schedule there, so that our numbers are not quite correct. We could provide that for the record for you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.648

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.649

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Thank you. But you do understand my concern, given the situation that California is in and the importance of these projects in helping us to meet that 13-year goal that we have.

Mr. Keys. As I said, the Title XVI program is very important to us. We have said many times that our wastewaters and the recycling programs are our river to tap for the future. They are important to us, but they are also very expensive, and the cost share program just takes lots of money through our program. We have to manage that through our appropriations.

SAN GABRIEL RESTORATION FUND

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Last year the committee transferred authority for the San Gabriel Restoration Fund from the Corps of Engineers to the Bureau in order to more quickly respond to the pending crisis of contaminated water that was moving from the San Gabriel Basin into the Central Basin. My understanding is that the Bureau has been very cooperative with the local sponsors on this project, and I am very grateful for that cooperation because it is an important project, and it needs to move forward in an expedited manner.

The groundwater contamination, as you know, was first discovered in 1979, and then it was identified by the EPA as a Superfund site in 1984. However, the inaction that had taken place over the past few years had allowed the contamination to actually seep through the Whittier Narrows and into a much larger Central Basin, which is having a direct effect on my constituents. If contamination was to spread further, the funds necessary to clean up the Central Basin would certainly be much, much more.

My question is why there is no request for funds for that

restoration fund.

Mr. Keys. Ms. Allard, I would say, first, that the monies that were transferred in 2002 from the Corps have been fully invested. The problem that we had there was an authority issue. We did not get the authority question resolved until after our proposed budget was put together.

The other is, within our current budget levels, we could not afford it. We need some extra levels of funding to help us out with that.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. This is, as you know, it is extremely important, especially for the local sponsors to be able to proceed towards this clean-up. Because if we do not do something now, it is going to be far more costly when it enters the Central Basin.

Secretary Norton. If I can also point out I am pleased that the Bureau of Reclamation is getting positive feedback on that, and we do want to work closely with the people affected. It is a pass-through program. This is not our usual area of expertise or responsibility, and so it is something that is a little out of the ordinary for us.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Do I have time for one more question?

Mr. Callahan. Sure.

Bureau's Declining Budget

Ms. Roybal-Allard. One of the facts that my water reclamation districts have brought to my attention is the Bureau's declining budget. I understand that since 1990, the Bureau's budget has declined from almost \$1 billion in appropriated funding to this year's request of \$805 million, which also represents a decrease of \$58 million below last year's enacted level.

At the same time, reclamation needs in California and elsewhere are rising: reclamation and reuse projects such as was talked about earlier; the Salton Sea; CALFED; Bay-Delta; environmental restoration; water projects in the Dakotas; Columbia and Snake River salmon recovery in the Northwest; and even some of the Indian settlements.

It appears that there seems to be a significant need to increase rather than to reduce the Bureau's budget. How does the Department plan to deal with these increasing demands on the Bureau's budget, and how are you going to prioritize your efforts?

Secretary Norton. I disagree on your math a little bit, but that is included within our documents.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Okay.

Secretary Norton. But your overall point is still the same.

Obviously, we have huge pressing issues that we have to balance. As a Nation, on the Executive Branch side, and with Congress we have to determine how to meet all of the most pressing needs. The Bureau of Reclamation, in its responsibilities, has shifted from the time when constructing huge dams was its responsibility. Today, the types of facilities that we build are still critically important, but they tend to be much smaller types of facilities. So we are working to try to meet water needs, but in a different kind of way in today's environment.

Ms. Roybal-Allard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Clerk's note.--The budget justifications submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation state: ``Without the legislative proposal, the request is \$805.3 million, a decrease of \$58.1 million from the FY 2002 enacted level of \$863.4 million.'']

Mr. Callahan. Mr. Doolittle.

Mr. Doolittle's Opening Remarks

Mr. Doolittle. I hope, Madam Secretary, and Commissioner, and ladies and gentlemen at the table, that you will not give up on the need to support dams, canals and reservoirs, when it makes sense. We certainly have such a situation in Northern California at Auburn, where there is about \$300 million of Federal investment sitting there that could be completed and provide flood protection, water supply, recreation, environmental enhancement, flood control, et cetera, for the region.

So do not worry about being too politically correct. In fact, I wish you would just do the right thing and forget about the politics of it. It probably would end up pretty good if you would work on that.

By the way, in my humble opinion, unless and until we enact a reauthorization bill for CALFED, I would not waste too much of your money on that. A lot of people seem to feel that is not going to produce too much in the way of new water for us. I would agree with Mrs. Roybal-Allard. I share her concern about your budget.

California Projects

There are some very innovative projects going on in California. In fact, I think the largest water recycling project in the world is down there around El Segundo someplace, which is truly amazing to see how that water is reclaimed from the sewage treatment plant right next door at Hyperion. It is purified. It is more pure than just about any other source of water you could get once they are through that process. In fact, they have a contract with Chevron, and they provide almost completely, 100-percent pure water to Chevron for their refinery processes next door. It is truly amazing.

In fact, as I understand it, in just a matter of 3 or 4 years, they are expecting to be able to produce, through reclamation, about 100,000 acre feet of water. If you are not going to give us dams, canals, and reservoirs, then you better be giving us some money to work on some of these other things.

So let me urge you and urge this committee to take a look at that. There is some very promising advances. They even believe that with a little extra help financially that they are capable of desalinating water now. The cost has been cut dramatically. It is going to be down to, oh, I think it was just under \$800 an acre foot of water. Whereas, 10 years ago, 1990, I think when Santa Barbara was trying it, it was about \$2,000 an acre foot. So technological advancements have dramatically improved the prospects in this area, but they want to do a pilot project down there, and that is something I think that should be carefully considered and may merit our support.

Klamath Basin

I am going to be representing the Klamath area. Now we have had this finding by the National Research Council that there was no scientific basis to withhold water from the farmers, but our extreme environmentalists accomplished their objectives, aided and abetted by the previous administration, and a lot of farmers are out of business.

So my question to you, ladies and gentlemen, is are the Klamath Basin farmers going to get their anticipated allotment of water this year?

Secretary Norton. Congressman, we anticipate that they will. We have examined the National Academy of Sciences' study, and Mr. Keys can talk more about the biological assessment that was just released yesterday. I think that that provides some encouraging news for the farmers there.

The National Academy of Sciences basically said that there was not much evidence for departing from the 1990's time period's regime, from either reducing it below that or from requiring more. So we are looking at that 1990's time frame.

We are also continuing to look at other efforts that can be made in the area. We still have the Fish and Wildlife Service review coming up as a part of going forward for next year's operations. We also have the good news of more water supply being available just by virtue of the weather, and so we are very thankful that we have that going for us as well.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. Doolittle. Well, let me ask you this: The Fish and Wildlife Service has been totally out of control, particularly in California, and that is within your jurisdiction. What are you doing to change things to bring about a more reasonable set of behaviors by the Fish and Wildlife Service in California?

Secretary Norton. There is a new Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Steve Williams, who comes to us after having been the State Fish and Game director for Kansas. He is a scientist himself. He understands the scientific issues. I believe he will provide very strong leadership for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

We are looking at ways to strengthen science within the Department. I believe it is important that we have the principles of peer review, of strong professional standards, and a wise allocation of our resources so that we have people who are truly qualified as scientists who are making the appropriate judgments on our scientific determinations.

Mr. Doolittle. Do you feel that those changes will be sufficient to prevent the next Klamath Basin, where some arrogant biologist at the field level decides to make a determination that will ruin the lives of hundreds of people and put them out of business, cost them millions of dollars? Do you feel like enough changes have been made that we will not ever see something like that happen again?

Secretary Norton. Congressman, these issues are difficult ones. The Endangered Species Act gives a great deal of authority to determinations made at the local level. We are

attempting to address those issues as we become aware of them.

I believe that we will have a strong management system in place to begin addressing those things. Let me also say that there are inherent difficulties in the Klamath Basin and in many other areas, where we have over-appropriated water and environmental issues on top of that. So I cannot say, with assurance, that we will not have Klamath-type difficulties in other places. I can say that we will be able to take a closer look at those issues if they arise.

Mr. Doolittle. One of the concerns I have, and I do not know of any other agency that is like this, is that normally, if somebody down at the lower level makes decisions, those are subject to review and modification higher up, but in the Fish and Wildlife Service that does not seem to be the case. That is certainly not the culture. Now are you saying this result is produced by the Endangered Species Act, or is that something where the pattern that has existed could, indeed, be changed?

Secretary Norton. That is part of the structure of the Endangered Species Act. The way in which the decisions are made make it very difficult for anyone further up the chain to change the direction after it is initially established at the field level.

We do not have that kind of an approach when it comes to other aspects of Fish and Wildlife Service management. Those operate in the same way as any other departments. That requires a lot more advanced planning, making sure that we have the scientific review process in place and that we plan ahead on those. So addressing this is something very much on our radar screen.

TRANSFER OF FACILITIES

Mr. Doolittle. You are working on that.

I apologize. I came late, so maybe the chairman asked this question, but for my final question, I would like to inquire about this--the Bureau some time ago determined it was going to facilitate the transfer of facilities back into the hands of the local districts that operate them. The way that the Interior Department interrelates to the Bureau of Reclamation is a disaster, in my opinion, in this one respect, that if we work to pass legislation, the solicitors report to the Interior Department, not the Bureau of Reclamation. We follow the advice that is given to us by the solicitors, and then once we pass an act of Congress, we are informed by the solicitor, oh, this is not drafted right. Well, they are the ones that drafted it.

I am experiencing this with reference to Sly Park. Commissioner, you and I talked about this. Have you been able to look into that situation yet?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Doolittle, yes, sir, we have. We are going back to see if there is not some way that we can accomplish what you are trying to do there. There is a problem with the water rights there, and the authorization to make that transfer.

If there is any way possible to do it with the current legislation, we will do that; if not, we will come back and talk with you.

Mr. Doolittle. I am not going to argue the details. Thank

you. Keep looking into it. I hope you find a way to make it happen. I mean, an act of Congress is a big deal. I did not realize how big a deal that was, really, until I became a member of Congress. When we go to the trouble to pass such a thing, and then have the very people who advised us on how to draft it tell us there is a flaw in the drafting, it does not sit very well. I had exactly the same thing happen with legislation that we passed for Mr. Solomon Ortiz in Corpus Christi, Texas, where we had to go back and pass a second bill after the solicitor misadvised us on drafting the first bill.

Could you supply for the record information on transfers or, if you know off the top of your head, tell us, but I know we have had a handful of transfers. Despite the Clinton administration's professed policy to support this, it was like pulling teeth to ever actually get them approved, and I would like to know what is the status of the transfers that were approved by the Congress, how many have actually been affected, and secondly what is this administration proposing relative to future transfers?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Doolittle, we have a number of them completed, a number of them underway, and we would certainly supply you a list of all of those that are completed, underway and maybe even anticipated.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.650

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.651

Mr. Doolittle. Thank you.

CALIFORNIA ISSUES FOLLOW-UP

Mr. Callahan. Following up on some of Congressman Doolittle's remarks, this is almost a sovereignty issue with respect to the State of California. They want the Federal Government to be involved in intrastate problems, and I guess we have to be because of the cost. But my observation, I have visited that area of the Auburn Dam, just looking at it from outside the forest, Congressman Doolittle is right. There is no reason we should not proceed in that direction.

Secondly, we are criticized when we appropriate money for nonauthorized projects. Now this authorization bill has been pending for years, and I am tired of hearing from the leadership and from other members of Congress, ``Why are you guys always appropriating money without authorization?''

My advice to you is to get with the principles of the two sides of this debate and get an authorization bill. I do not know what the bill should say, but I do know there are two sides.

Thirdly, with respect to Klamath and obeying existing laws, the Endangered Species Act says that you must include an economic impact factor in your decision-making. Fish and Wildlife has ignored this, but you, as the Secretary of the Interior, ought to be filing injunctions against Fish and Wildlife if, indeed, they are violating the law.

In the Klamath situation, obviously, the law was violated. And even the scientific evidence that was produced, that the

National Academy of Science indicate that it was erroneous, indicates to me that someone in this administration or someone in this Congress has got to take on Fish and Wildlife and has got to tell them they just cannot, because one individual wants to do something, he cannot disrupt the lives and the economy of an entire community of the United States. So that is something I would suggest you consider, in ridiculous cases such as Klamath, that you ought to file injunctions against Fish and Wildlife.

Secretary Norton. Mr. Chairman, the Klamath situation has been very disturbing for us. We were concerned by what we saw from the science. We understood the limitations of those of us coming in at the upper management levels to counteract what the scientists were telling us was necessary. That is why we referred this matter to the National Academy of Sciences for their review.

I want to say that I do not think any laws were violated. It was a question of scientific judgment that was exercised.

Mr. Callahan. Well, maybe not a violation, but certainly the consideration of economic impact on these farmers was not taken into consideration, and the Endangered Species Act specifically says it must. It was ignored, and this did not happen under your watch. We know that. I am saying, indeed, if you are faced with this again, then get your solicitor, get your staff to read the Endangered Species Act, and they must comply with all of it, not just what some environmentalist wants them to comply with, when it impacts the livelihoods of people as dramatically as this one did.

Secretary Norton. Mr. Chairman, we are going through a review of our Endangered Species administration policies to make sure that we are acting in a way that is consistent with the act and to make sure that we are looking at ways to try to avoid some of these types of situations by having a good approach. To make sure, for example, that economic analysis is considered within the critical habitat designations, which is the area where that is clearly authorized. We are working on a number of ways to improve that process.

BUDGET REQUEST TO OMB

Mr. Callahan. Good. Let me just ask another question, and you do not have to answer it if you do not want to, and that is about the submission of your budget request to OMB this year. What did you ask them for in both your areas of jurisdiction?

Secretary Norton. I do not have that information.

Mr. Callahan. Was it more or less than you got?

Secretary Norton. As usual, there were some issues where we had more, some where we had less. I do not have the particulars.

Mr. Callahan. Did you ask, Commissioner, for more or less?

Mr. Keys. Mr. Chairman, in some areas more; in some areas, less. [Laughter.]

Mr. Callahan. I am going to tell you, you are going to get more or less than what the OMB submits. [Laughter.]

We have been amazed here, during this appropriation process, at the ability of one individual who has an agenda-- down in the bowels of OMB to completely force you all to come

and ask for less, when you know full well that you cannot fulfill your total mission with the amount they are recommending. I applaud you for following your commander-in-chief, and the President of the United States and backing up his budget request. But the Appropriations Committee, especially, is growing more and more concerned about OMB dictating policy through the appropriation process.

I wondered if you have found, either of you have found, during the OMB process, that maybe there were some individuals there that were trying to impose their own philosophies or agendas on policy by refusing to include monies that you requested for specific programs.

Secretary Norton. Mr. Chairman, the OMB role is a difficult one. They have to keep all of us from asking for the moon, and especially when we have approaches that need to be taken into account to deal with September 11th and the new priorities because of that. They have had a very difficult time, and we have worked very closely with them to try to meet those needs. I have recognized that we are in a situation today that requires all of us to be fiscally conservative in what we are looking at to try to make sure that we are operating as effectively as possible within the dollar amounts that are realistically available.

So we are taking very seriously the management initiatives that the President is pushing for that I think will allow us to provide better services at a lower cost. The President feels strongly that those types of improvements in Government services are things that are necessary and that we need to avoid getting ourselves into a situation of overspending so that we are causing problems for future years.

Mr. Callahan. Well, we do not fault the President, nor do we really fault his Cabinet, but we find that, in some instances, OMB, even contrary or without even any advance notice to some of the departments, is invoking their own personal agenda into the budget process indicating that the administration does not support certain things, when, indeed, the administration does. I just wondered if you all had had any similar experience, where you had a successful program and some individual at OMB did not like it so they just left it out of your request.

Secretary Norton. We have gone back-and-forth with OMB, as everybody does, as we do with Congress. They have their appropriate role. Where we have felt strongly about something, we have made clear that we feel strongly about it. So it is, I think, a healthy back and forth.

Mr. Callahan. Are you satisfied with what they asked for, and you can fully run your responsibilities and charges with the money that OMB is requesting?

Mr. Keys. Yes, sir. We have good luck working with them right now. While there may be some directions from above that we are not aware of, the examiners that we work with have been very fair and good to work with. Our allotment this year was more than last year, so we have had good luck working with them.

Mr. Callahan. Well, we find that especially true in areas of a more liberal agenda, especially toward the environment. They are infiltrated with environmentalists over there, and it

is not just in the jurisdiction of this committee, it is other committees. I serve on Foreign Operations, and I was chairman of that committee for 6 years and created a child survival account, which is the most popular form of foreign assistance that we deliver worldwide, not only with people in other nations, but with the Congress. And simply because of one individual who happened to work in the Senate when I started this program, the administration was embarrassed because this was left out, because of one individual's desire to leave something out that she did not particularly like. But that is not a problem we can resolve today.

Your problem is convincing the Congress to give you an adequate supply of money to effectively run your organizations, and we are going to do that.

Do you have any further questions?

CALFED

Mr. Visclosky. Just for a moment. I would follow up on Mr. Doolittle's point, as far as the transfers, both those in process, Mr. Commissioner, as well as prospective. John, before you came, I also had addressed the issue of CALFED, and I am not opposed to the program, but my concern is, as I had expressed earlier, is that if we continue to appropriate money piecemeal under current authorization, we are not going to force the issue and bring all of the parties, as the chairman also suggested, to the table and resolve the authorization issues.

Mr. Doolittle. Would you yield just for a response?

Mr. Visclosky. Sure.

Mr. Doolittle. I appreciate both of you bringing that up. This CALFED is great for only one group so far, the environmentalists. They are getting everything they want. Nobody else is getting anything, and I do not think we ought to continue to indulge them in that. The whole thing was supposed to be we all get well together, but only one group is getting well. Frankly, some of these districts who really need the water have already given up on CALFED. They are going to move to other ways, recycling, desalination, water reuse of one kind or another because they just cannot wait for this chimera of CALFED, which has now been in play for some number of years, and which has failed to deliver anything. So do not be too sanguine about CALFED, please.

Mr. Visclosky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Callahan. Ms. Allard?

Ms. Roybal-Allard. No.

Mr. Callahan. Thank you very much for your testimony. We have additional questions we will submit for the record.

Secretary Norton. Thank you.

[Questions submitted for the record and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.652

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.653

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.654

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.655

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.656

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.657

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.658

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.659

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.660

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.661

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.662

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.663

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.664

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.665

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.666

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.667

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.668

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.669

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.670

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.671

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.672

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.673

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.674

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.675

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.676

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.677

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.678

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.679

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.680

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.681

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.682

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.683

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.684

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.685

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.686

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.687

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.688

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.689

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.690

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.691

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.692

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.693

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.694

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.695

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.696

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.697

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.698

Mr. Callahan. At this point, we will place the budget justifications for the Appalachian Regional Commission in the record.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.699

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.700

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.701

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.702

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.703

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.704

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.705

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.706

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.707

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.708

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.709

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.710

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.711

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.712

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.713

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.714

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.715

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.716

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.717

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.718

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.719

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.720

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.721

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.722

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.723

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.724

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.725

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.726

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.727

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.728

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.729

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.730

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.731

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.732

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.733

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.734

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.735

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.736

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.737

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.738

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.739

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.740

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.741

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.742

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.743

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.744

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.745

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.746

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.747

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.748

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.749

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.750

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.751

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.752

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.753

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.754

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.755

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.756

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.757

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.758

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.759

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.760

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.761

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.762

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.763

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.764

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.765

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.766

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.767

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.768

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.769

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.770

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.771

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.772

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.773

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.774

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.775

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.776

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.777

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.778

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.779

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.780

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.781

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.782

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.783

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.784

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.785

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.786

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.787

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.788

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.789

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.790

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.791

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.792

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.793

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.794

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.795

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.796

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.797

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.798

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.799

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.800

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.801

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.802

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.803

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.804

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.805

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.806

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.807

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.808

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.809

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.810

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.811

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.812

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.813

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.814

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.815

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.816

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.817

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.818

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.819

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.820

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.821

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.822

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.823

[GRAPHIC] [TIFF OMITTED] T9478A.824

I N D E X

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

	Page
Ak Chin Indian Water Rights Settlement Project.....	712
Animas-La Plata Project.....	3, 23
Bend Feed Canal Pipeline.....	724
Boise Area Project.....	721
Bureau of Reclamation, Budget Justifications, FY 2003.....	31-614
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	675, 700
CALFED.....	625, 627, 647, 790
California Water Quality and Reliability Act of 2001 (H.R. 2404).....	627
California Projects and Issues.....	683, 688
California Bay-Delta Restoration.....	25, 647, 692
California Investigations Program.....	716
California 4.4 Plan.....	677
California Ecosystem, Water Supply, and Water Quality Act of 2001 (S. 976).....	640
Callahan, Congressman Sonny, Opening Remarks.....	1
Central Utah Project, Budget Justification, FY 2003.....	615-623
Central Utah Project.....	4, 11, 23
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.....	25, 705, 731
Central Valley Project.....	23
Central Arizona Project.....	23, 712
Colorado Ute Tribes.....	3
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project--Title I.....	714
Colorado River Storage Project--Section 5.....	24
Colorado-Big Thompson.....	709
Columbia/Snake River ESA Implementation Program.....	721
Columbia-Snake River Salmon Recovery.....	24
Cooperative Conservation Initiative.....	3, 7
Diamond Fork System.....	4
District Court for the District of Columbia.....	3
Doolittle, Congressman John, Opening Remarks.....	682
Drainage Management Program.....	719
Drought.....	27, 704
Edwards, Congressman Chet, Opening Statement.....	655
Endangered Species Conservation/Recovery.....	703, 723
Everglades.....	11
Fish Screen Improvement Projects.....	717
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	684
Frelinghuysen, Congressman Rodney, Opening Remarks.....	657
Gila River.....	653
Glen Colusa Irrigation District.....	719
Homeland Security.....	13
Hoover Dam Visitors Center.....	663, 675
Hunter, Congressman Duncan, Statement.....	651
Indian Education.....	10
Investigations Programs.....	702

Kendrick Project.....	710
Keys, Commissioner John, Opening Remarks.....	17
Keys, Commissioner John, Prepared Statement.....	20
Klamath Project.....24, 683,	696
Klamath Feasibility Studies.....	720
Klamath-A-Canal.....	720
Lake Mead/Las Vegas Wash Program.....	714
Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development.....	720
Landowner Partnerships and Other Conservation Tools.....	8
Lewis and Clark Rural Water System.....	711
Loan Program.....	704
Long-Term Water Supply Study.....	655
Lower Colorado River Operations Program.....	24
Mni Wiconi Project.....	737
National Wildlife Refuge Centennial.....	12
Natoma Pipeline System Replacement.....	716
New York and New Jersey Highlands.....	657
Norton, Secretary Gayle, Opening Remarks.....	1
Norton, Secretary Gayle, Prepared Statement.....	5
Operation and Maintenance Backlog.....	658
Park Maintenance Backlog and Natural Resources.....	11
Pastor, Congressman Ed, Opening Remarks.....	662
Placer County Water Agency.....	717
Platte River Recovery Implementation Program.....	709
Policy and Administration.....	709
Power O&M.....	728
Recreation Management.....	721
Sacramento River Contract Litigation Settlement.....	718
Safety of Dams.....23,	27
Salton Sea.....624, 651, 652, 653,	715
San Gabriel Restoration Fund.....681,	715
Selected Solution.....	719
Site Security/Counter Terrorism.....23, 666, 697, 725,	730
South Dakota Rural Water Projects.....	24
Title Transfer of Facilities.....685,	701
Trust Programs.....	8
Upper Colorado Region.....	711
Visclosky, Congressman Peter, Opening Remarks.....	625
Water Reclamation and Reuse Projects.....25, 27, 677, 704,	733
Western Water Enhancement Security Act (H.R. 1985).....	627
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project.....	723

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Summary of Budget Request.....	742
Mission and Record of Success.....	743
General Statement and Summary.....	744
Area Development Program.....	754
Appalachian Development Highway System.....	764
Local Development Districts and Technical Assistance.....	768
Salaries and Expenses.....	772
ARC Administrative Expenses.....	775
Independent Evaluation of ARC Programs.....	776
Telecommunications Plan and Record of Accomplishments.....	783
Socio-Economic Data.....	787
Regional Maps.....	800
Annual Performance Plan.....803-866	

